

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Minnesota

United States of America

v.

Yolanda Dean

Date of Original Judgment:

12/14/1998

Date of Previous Amended Judgment:

(Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Any)

Case No: 97cr276(3) (MJD/JGL)USM No: 12615-112

pro se

Defendant's Attorney

ORDER REGARDING MOTION FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)

Upon motion of ☒ the defendant ☐ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking into account the policy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10 and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent that they are applicable,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:

☒ DENIED. ☐ GRANTED and the defendant's previously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in the last judgment issued) of _____ months is reduced to _____.

I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures)

Previous Offense Level: <u>42</u>	Amended Total Offense Level: <u>42</u>
Criminal History Category: <u>III</u>	Criminal History Category: <u>III</u>
Previous Guideline Range: <u>360 months-life</u>	Amended Guideline Range: <u>360 months-life</u>

II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO THE AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE

- ☐ The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing as a result of a substantial assistance departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline range.

II. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Defendant's Guideline range is not affected by the retroactive crack cocaine amendment. Therefore, the Court does not have the authority to lower her sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). See U.S. v. Tolliver, 570 F.3d 1062, 1066-67 (8th Cir. 2009). Additionally, the Fair Sentencing Act was not retroactive, so she is not entitled to a sentence reduction under that Act. See U.S. v. Neadeau, 639 F.3d 453, 456 (8th Cir. 2011).

Except as otherwise provided, all provisions of the judgment dated _____ shall remain in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Order Date:

2-13-12



Judge's signature

Effective Date:

(if different from order date)

Michael J. Davis, Chief Judge, D. Minn.

Printed name and title